



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

*THE BOOK OF ISAIAH: CRITICAL PROBLEMS AND
A NEW COMMENTARY*¹

KEMPER FULLERTON

OBERLIN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Professor Gray's commentary on Numbers (1903) not only filled a vacant place in English exegetical literature, but had to do with a book that has usually been perfunctorily treated by serial commentators; and this made an intrinsically valuable work doubly welcome. Isaiah, on the contrary, competes with the Psalms for the distinction of being the subject of more commentaries than any other book in the Old Testament, and of some of the best. The inevitable question therefore is, Wherein does the volume before us mark an advance beyond its predecessors? To answer this question it will be necessary to indicate the problems with which the critical study of Isaiah is at present chiefly concerned, and to show what progress has been made toward a solution of them.

There are three clearly marked periods in the criticism of Isaiah: from 1778 to about 1820; from 1820 to 1880; and from 1880 to the present time.

The first period begins with Bishop Lowth's translation of Isaiah (1778). Lowth was interested primarily in the aesthetic appreciation of the prophet. It was the glory of Hebrew poetry which he wished to see revealed. This glory was often obscured by the corruption of the text. Hence much attention was given to the establishment of a better text, often by brilliant conjectural emendations which have become a part of subsequent exegetical tradition. Lowth's work was translated into German in 1779-81 by Richerz, and supplied with notes by Koppe. In these notes Koppe for the first time directs attention to the critical problems of the book. Are the connections between its various sections original and organic, or are they artificial and com-

¹ A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Isaiah, I-XXXIX. By George Buchanan Gray. Vol. I, Introduction, and Commentary on I-XXVII. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1912.

pilatory? Koppe maintained the latter view. Again, are the historical backgrounds of the prophecies in all cases the real backgrounds, or are they sometimes assumed backgrounds? This question was most urgent in connection with what may be called the Babylonian elements in Isaiah.² The usual theory had been that Isaiah, projecting himself by inspiration into the future, had taken the point of view of the Babylonian exile, or even of later times. Koppe suggested that what was supposed to be only an assumed background was after all the real background. Koppe's hints were taken up and elaborated by several scholars at the close of the eighteenth and beginning of the nineteenth centuries, of whom Eichhorn was the most influential. In *Die hebraischen Propheten* (1816) Eichhorn resolved Isaiah into some eighty-five fragments, dating from various periods in the history of Judah, and in his *Einleitung*, the fourth edition of which (1823-24) may be considered to close the first period of criticism, he summed up in precise form the arguments against the genuineness of the expressly Babylonian elements in Isaiah. By this time chapters 24-27 and chapters 34 and 35, out of the first part of Isaiah, had also been drawn into the critical stream and carried off to the exilic or post-exilic period. In the criticism of these chapters, especially in the case of chapters 24-27, not only the probable historical backgrounds had been used as arguments against their genuineness, but also their peculiar religious ideas; for example, the doctrine of the resurrection in chapters 24-27.

The second period in the critical Isaiah-analysis lasted above sixty years, say, from 1820 to 1880. In it fall the works of three great commentators: Gesenius, whose commentary appeared in 1821, Hitzig (1833), and Ewald (1840-41; last edition, 1867-68). Upon the philological, exegetical, and critical foundations laid by these scholars most of the other work in this period was based, either by way of strengthening and continuing their work or in the attempt to check further building operations on the lines they had laid out. Both Gesenius and Ewald represent a distinct reaction from the disintegrating tendency of Koppe and Eichhorn, while Hitzig carried on the work of the earlier critics,

² Primarily, 44-66; 13 1-14 23; 21 1-10.

though in a more tempered form. But the great authority of Gesenius and Ewald prevailed, and at the end of this second period there was general agreement among critics only in the elimination of the prophecies already mentioned,³ though a feeling of insecurity was often expressed as to certain other chapters also.⁴

But with the removal of Isa. 40-66, or Second Isaiah, to the exile, a large part of the consolatory prophecies in the book had been taken away from Isaiah. Of the rejected parts of Isa. 1-39, chapters 24-27 and 34-35, also, were consolatory. The elimination of so many of the consolatory prophecies could not fail to react on the conception of Isaiah's outlook upon the future. A new problem thus emerged, namely, to determine what at different stages of his career the prophet Isaiah expected the future to bring forth, in distinction from the expectations of other men and other times which are embodied in the Book of Isaiah. This was to prove the central problem in the criticism of the book, into which all others finally lead. But until the end of the second period little had been done toward disengaging this problem from the multitude of critical and exegetical questions which had arisen in the progress of investigation.

The merit of having first grasped and formulated the problem of Isaiah's eschatology on the basis of the critical results generally accepted in the middle decades of the nineteenth century may fairly be given to Bernhard Duhm in his *Theologie der Propheten* (1875). Robertson Smith's *Prophets of Israel*, which has the same critical premises with the *Theologie*, did not appear till seven years later (1882). It is perhaps not so original as Duhm's essay; yet it has exerted an equally profound influence upon subsequent investigation, and still remains the most brilliant exposition of Isaiah's religious significance which we possess in English. At crucial points these two essays are in the sharpest antithesis, and the differences mark the lines of division in the subsequent criticism and interpretation of Isaiah.

³ Isaiah 40-66; 13 1-14 23; 21 1-10; 24-27; 34 and 35.

⁴ E.g. Ewald harbored doubts as to the genuineness of chapters 12 and 33. Hitzig's vigorous attack upon 19 16-25, in which he followed the lead of Koppe, had also made some impression.

If chapters 1-39 are closely examined, four great prophetic doctrines are found in them: The doctrine of the Day of the Lord; the doctrine of the Remnant; the doctrine of the Messianic King; and the doctrine of the impregnability of Zion, which last may be considered the obverse of the prophecies which foretell the destruction of Assyria. Of these doctrines Duhm lays the main emphasis upon the Day of the Lord, Smith makes the Remnant central. The difference between the two writers at this point had interesting consequences. The conception of the Day of the Lord, according to Duhm, approximates to the Christian conception of the Last Judgment. It is primarily a day of wrath (see ch. 2). At first Isaiah thinks of it as impending over Israel and Judah only, but later he comes to realize that all nations will be involved in the catastrophe. The present order of the world is to be changed. The future is in no sense a continuation of the present or an evolution out of the present, but the direct opposite of the present. The present must be totally destroyed in order to prepare the way for the future. The transition to the future is to be supernaturally effected, and the character of the future itself is supernatural. It is marked by a miraculous change in nature and the charism of the spirit (see chapters 11 and 32). Duhm's interpretation is based partly upon the implications of what may be called the anti-Assyrian prophecies,⁵ partly upon the sudden, unmediated transitions from threat to promise, as seen particularly in chapters 28-33.⁶ In all these prophecies the transition to the future era seems to be attributed to the direct intervention of God. Thus, if Duhm's interpretation be accepted, Isaiah's eschatology⁷ in its most characteristic features is apocalyptic. And in proportion as it is apocalyptic, the historical and moral interest is absent. Duhm

⁵ The most typical of these are chapters 10 and 18; but compare also the briefer prophecies, more or less fragmentary in character, 8 9 f.; 14 24-27; 17 12-14; 29 6-8; 30 27-33; 33; 37 22 f.

⁶ Compare 28 1-4 with verses 5 f.; 29 1-4 with verses 6-8; 29 9-15 with verses 16-25; 30 1-17 with verses 18-26 and 27-33; 31 1-4 with verses 5-9.

⁷ The reader should be apprised that here and throughout this article the word "eschatology" is used, after the example of some recent German authors, for the prophet's expectations or predictions about the future of his people, without implying that these expectations were "eschatological" in the etymological sense or in the established English meaning of the word.—ED.

himself is quite aware of this. He deliberately exalts what he calls the religious element in Isaiah's eschatology, by which he means the supernatural and apocalyptic element, at the expense of the ethical and historical. This involves him in difficulties, however, with the doctrines of the Remnant and the inviolability of Zion. If there is a Remnant, if Zion is not to perish in the final catastrophe, there would seem, after all, to be left something out of the present which passes over into the future. Even the figure of the Messianic king, who is a Davidic king, and so has historical connections, is not quite congruous with Duhm's apocalyptic interpretation of the future; and it is interesting to observe how little prominence Duhm gives to this conception. In particular the Messianic significance of Immanuel (7 14 and 8 8) is denied.

In contrast to Duhm, Smith lays the emphasis upon the ethical and historical. This is because he makes the idea of the Remnant central in Isaiah's teaching. For Duhm the Remnant is a future ideal; for Smith it is "a practical principle" in the present. The Remnant, accordingly, takes concrete shape: it is nothing else than the prophetic party which Isaiah developed out of a small group of his disciples⁸ into an effective organization. This Remnant is to be the basis of the ideal kingdom of the future. It is the connecting link between the present and the future, and through it the transition from the one to the other is to be morally achieved. The future is not a wholly new creation, as Duhm would have us believe, due to the sudden irruption of the divine into history; the future is the purified, idealized present. There is continuity in Jahweh's work. The doctrine of the Remnant is in turn connected with the doctrines of the inviolability of Zion and of the Messianic King. "Because the community of Jehovah [the Remnant] is indestructible, the state of Judah and the kingdom of the house of David cannot be utterly overthrown. . . . The capital and the court appeared to him as the natural centre of the true remnant." But how does all this rhyme with the doctrine of the Day of the Lord in which Judah and Israel are to be destroyed? In general, Smith seeks to supply moral connections between the threats and the promises. The

⁸ See 8 16-18, a passage hardly noticed by Duhm.

threats are recalled if, or when, king and people repent. But the difficulty is precisely that the ethical transitions have to be supplied by the reader. In the present form of the prophecies both judgments and consolations are expressed unconditionally. They are placed side by side, without any hint of an organic connection between them (see especially chapters 28-33, and note 6 above).

We begin to see our problem defining itself more sharply. How are we to reconcile those prophecies which unqualifiedly foretell the doom of the nation in the Day of the Lord with the predictions of a brighter future—the prophecies of the Remnant, the inviolability of Zion, and the Messianic King?⁹ It is the problem created by the conflicting representations of the national future in Isaiah 1-39, a problem illustrated by the divergent expositions of Duhm and Smith, which has given rise to the new development that characterizes the third period in the recent criticism of Isaiah. Investigation and discussion in this stage have centred about the problem of Isaiah's eschatology.¹⁰

This period, which may be said to run from about 1880 to the present time, may itself be divided into three stages: the stage of critical disintegration, from 1881 to 1892; the stage of critical reconstruction, from 1892 to 1905; and the stage of critical reaction, from 1905 to the present time.

The first of these stages is represented by the work of Stade, Soerensen, Guthe, Giesebrecht, and Duhm. With the exception of Duhm, these scholars have dealt only with particular problems in Isaiah.¹¹ I shall not attempt at this time to give a detailed statement in chronological order of the various contributions which these scholars have made to our subject. I must

⁹ Since the doctrine of the Remnant implies some sort of a judgment from which the Remnant escapes, this doctrine is not in such sharp contrast with the eschatology of doom as are the doctrines of the invulnerability of Zion and the Messianic King.

¹⁰ See especially chs. 2, 10, 18.

¹¹ See the series of articles by Stade in the *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* (1881-84), supplemented by his *Geschichte des Volkes Israel* (Vol. I, 1881-85); A. Soerensen, *Judah und die assyrische Weltmacht* (1885); Guthe, *Das Zukunftsbild des Jesaia*; Giesebrecht's article, *Die Immanuel-Weissagung*, in *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* (1888), and his monograph *Beiträge zur Jesaiakritik* (1890); Duhm, *Das Buch Jesaia* (1892, 2d ed. 1902).

content myself with setting forth the logical relations of the questions which they have discussed, as these bear upon the criticism and interpretation of Isaiah.

In Isaiah 1-39 (after the elimination of 13 1-14 23; 21 1-10; 24-27, and 34-35), there are four main critical problems which overshadow all others in interest and importance: *first*, The genuineness and date of the anti-Assyrian group of prophecies; *second*, The historical credibility of the narrative section, chapters 36-38; *third*, The unity, genuineness, and date of the remarkable section, chapters 28-33, with which chapter 22 is also to be associated; *fourth*, The interpretation and date of the prophecies of the Messianic King, namely, the Immanuel prophecies, chapters 6-8, and 9 1-7; 11 1 ff.; 32 1-8.

Stade's criticism was concerned mainly with the first two of these problems, though important hints were also dropped with respect to the last two. The immediate subject of Stade's first studies was not Isaiah, but Zechariah and Micah. The genuineness of Zech. 9-14 and Mic. 4-7 was denied, and these important sections were ascribed to a period after the time of Ezekiel. The argument turned mainly, though not exclusively, on the agreement between these sections and Ezek. 38 and 39. In all three passages there is a conception of a great duel between Jehovah and the nations, in which Jehovah was to triumph, and thus vindicate his absolute supremacy as a universal God. Stade argued that in Ezekiel this idea is worked out in an organic and intelligible way, whereas in the disputed portions of Zechariah and Micah it is not worked out at all, but is presented in an allusive fashion which implied that the idea was already well-known and a part of prophetic tradition. Hence it was inferred that Zech. 9-14 and Mic. 4-7 probably followed Ezekiel. But it thereupon became evident that the assignment of these sections to post-exilic times put in question the genuineness of several of the anti-Assyrian prophecies of Isaiah in which substantially the same idea of a conflict between Jehovah and the world power, or powers, was expressed. Stade was thus led ultimately to reject, in addition to Zech. 9-14 and Mic. 4-7, the anti-Assyrian prophecies, Isa. 8 9 f.; 14 24-27; 17 12-14; 29 7; 33; 37 22 ff. It will be remembered that these prophecies teach by implication the doc-

trine of the inviolability of Zion. Stade's criticism is thus seen to make a large inroad upon those prophecies in which this doctrine is expressed or implied. Yet Stade still held to the genuineness of Isa. 10; 18; 30 27-33; and 31 5-9; and so long as this was done, the rejection of the other anti-Assyrian prophecies did not in principle affect the eschatology of Isaiah.¹²

In the rejection of 37 22 ff. the trustworthiness of the surrounding narrative section, chapters 36-38, in which the campaign of Sennacherib in 701 B.C. is narrated, became involved. Stade showed that, instead of one narrative of this campaign, chapters 36 and 37 contain two accounts of the same campaign, which differed in various ways and gave evidence of legendary accretion. Now critics had referred most of the anti-Assyrian prophecies, particularly chapters 10 and 18, to the time of Hezekiah's revolt and Sennacherib's invasion of Judah (705-701 B.C.), associating them chronologically with the campaign in which they were conspicuously fulfilled. But what would be the result when, on the one hand, the genuineness of the anti-Assyrian prophecies as a group began to be impugned, and, on the other, the credibility of the historical narrative was thrown into doubt? This question did not present itself to Stade, inasmuch as he accepted the most characteristic anti-Assyrian prophecies and also the truth of the central fact in Isa. 36 f., namely, the deliverance of Jerusalem. But it is evident that others who followed him so far might not stop where he did.

Stade's rejection of chapter 33, also, had far-reaching consequences. The close connection between chapters 32 and 33 was obvious, and this led Stade to include both in the same judgment. Now chapters 32 and 33 have two important characteristics. In content they are thoroughly eschatological, doom and deliverance alternating in unmediated juxtaposition, and the eschatology of hope predominating. In literary connection they had always been associated with chapters 28-31, as a kind of appendix. When they were abandoned, therefore, a considerable

¹² Stade sought to justify his retention of a part of the anti-Assyrian prophecies, while rejecting the rest, by pointing out that in the accepted group Isaiah was dealing with the one historical nation, Assyria; whereas the rejected prophecies dealt vaguely with many nations. The accepted prophecies were thus construed historically, while the rejected prophecies were vaguely eschatological.

body of eschatological material was further subtracted from Isaiah, and a breach was made in the integrity of the section, Isa. 28-33. This attack was advanced by Giesebrecht in a very thorough discussion of the opening chapter of the section. He undertook to show that the present sequence of the several prophecies in this chapter (Isa. 28 1-4, 5 f., 7-22, 23-29) cannot possibly be an original and organic sequence, and attempted to account for the present order as due to successive revisions by Isaiah himself at different periods of his life. To support this view he sought evidence of revision elsewhere in the book, and contended that 8 9 f. and 17 12-14 (prophecies against Assyria which had been rejected by Stade) were, indeed, incongruous in their contexts, but could be explained as later revisions by Isaiah himself of the earlier and gloomier prophecies that preceded.

The question whether Giesebrecht's theory of revisions by Isaiah himself or Stade's theory of later additions and interpolations by other writers is the more probable explanation in such cases of incongruous contexts, confronts us again when we turn to the main body of chapters 28-33. Here we find the most abrupt transitions from threat to promise (see above, note 6). These transitions are all the more inexplicable when the prophecies in which they occur are properly dated. As long as the integrity of Isa. 28 was maintained, it was common to let 28 1-4, which must belong to a time before the fall of Samaria (722), determine the age of the whole. But when the unity of chapter 28 was given up, it was easy for Giesebrecht to show that at least 28 7-22 was intimately connected with chapters 29-31, and the latter chapters, which are directed against an Egyptian alliance, were most naturally placed between 705 and 701 B.C., when it is known that Judah was negotiating with Egypt against Assyria. The alliance with Egypt was, however, in direct opposition to the advice of the prophet in chapters 28-31. We should therefore expect in these chapters, as Giesebrecht himself points out, threats, not promises; and this expectation is justified by 22 1-14, which very clearly reflects the situation in 701, and contains only denunciations. Thus, both from the point of view of their literary connections—or, rather, lack of connections—and from the point of view of the historical situation, the position

of the hopeful prophecies in Isa. 28-31 is seen to be increasingly difficult; and it is not surprising to find Soerensen denying that these prophecies belong in their present connections at all. His observations, however, were casual, and made little impression at the time.

It is more important for the present to note the effect which Giesebrecht's criticism and his dating of Isa. 28-31 has upon the anti-Assyrian prophecies. When it has been shown that a group of prophecies predominantly threatening in tone belong to the time of Sennacherib, and that it is menacing prophecies which are to be expected in the circumstances, what is to be judged about the anti-Assyrian prophecies, which are all unqualifiedly consolatory and encouraging? Giesebrecht accepts the genuineness of these prophecies, but removes them all (with the exception of 37 22 ff. and the two oracles, 30 27-33 and 31 5-9, which lie within chapters 28-31) to an earlier period in Isaiah's life (711). By this proceeding the prophecies of hope in chapters 28-31 are left in a still more isolated and unaccountable position. It is evident that, when once chapters 28-31 are included in the discussion, the problem of Isaiah's previsions of the future in the days of Sennacherib becomes increasingly perplexing. Are the anti-Assyrian prophecies genuine? If so, are they to be assigned to the time of Sennacherib? What is their relation to chapters 28-31? What is the relation of the threats in chapters 28-31 to the promises? These are the questions which press for a solution.

Stade's rejection of chapters 32 and 33, which began the work of disintegrating Isa. 28-31, also initiated the criticism of the Messianic prophecies. Isaiah 32, in which the Messianic prophecy, 32 1-8, occurs, had usually been placed in the later years of Isaiah's career. Chapter 11 was supposed to be organically connected with 10 through the contrast between the felled forest of Assyria (10 33 ff.) and the revived sprout of the stump of Jesse (11 1). Hence 11 1 ff. was also assigned to Isaiah's latest period. Guthe rejected chapter 32, with Stade; but he went a step farther and denied that the connection between chapters 10 and 11 was original: it was, as he had no difficulty in showing, compilatory and not organic. With the separation of chapter 11 from 10,

the Messianic prophecy in chapter 11 became chronologically homeless. Guthe found shelter for it by associating it with the closely kindred prophecy, 9 1-7. The latter was apparently organically connected with chapters 7 and 8, which were securely anchored in the period of the invasion of Judah by the allies, Syria and Israel (734). The effect of denying the genuineness of 32 1-8 and of shifting 11 1 ff. to a place beside 9 1-7 was that all the prophecies of the Messianic King, including the Immanuel prophecies in 7 14 and 8 8, which Guthe interpreted messianically, fell in an early period of Isaiah's ministry, whereas the figure of the Messianic King disappears altogether from the later prophecies. In the latter the doctrines of the Remnant and the inviolability of Zion take its place. Guthe's reconstruction of Isaiah's eschatology may thus be regarded as a kind of synthesis of the theories of Duhm and Smith. In the early period Isaiah is supposed to have entertained a more supernaturalistic conception of the future, which centres about the ideas of the Day of the Lord and of the Messianic King, who, according to Guthe, belongs to the new order, after the old things have passed away. In the later period of his life Isaiah's view of the future is shaped by his doctrine of the Remnant and the invulnerability of Zion, and is consequently more historical and ethical than his earlier conception. Guthe's labored attempt to account for these changes in Isaiah's anticipations of the future need not detain us; for no sooner had this theory been built up than it was undermined, though unawares, by Giesebrecht. Giesebrecht also rejected chapter 32, with Stade, and, with Guthe, severed 11 from its connection with 10, ascribing it to the same age with 9 1-7; but he followed Duhm in denying the Messianic import of Immanuel in 7 14, and by textual criticism eliminated Immanuel from 8 8. Now, the strongest link by which 9 1-7 is united with chapters 7 and 8 is the supposed identification of the Messianic child in 9 1-7 with Immanuel (interpreted messianically) in 7 14 and 8 8.

If Immanuel is not the Messiah, this link is broken, and only one slender filament connects 9 1-7 with chapters 7 and 8, namely, the verse 9 1 compared with 2 Kings 15 29. The latter describes the devastation of Gilead and Galilee by the Assyrians in 734,

and the reference to the same events in Isa. 9 1 might seem to fix the date of the following prophecy in the same period. If this connection with chapters 7 and 8 were broken, the Messianic prophecies in 9 2-7 and 11 1 ff. would be set chronologically adrift. On what unknown shores would they finally land?

The disintegrating work of the scholars mentioned above reached its climax in the commentary on Isaiah by Bernhard Duhm (1892). This commentary makes an epoch in the criticism and interpretation of the prophet. In the influence it has exerted it ranks with the commentaries of Gesenius, Hitzig, and Ewald. Yet I have ventured to assign Duhm's commentary to the era of disintegration rather than to the era of reconstruction. As a matter of fact, the theory of the significance of Isaiah advanced in the commentary differs in no essential particular from that presented in the *Theologie der Propheten*. But Duhm perceived clearly and applied consistently the great critical principles of which previous investigators had only caught glimpses, or which they had been able to apply only in isolated instances. In so doing he brought all previous criticism to a head, and prepared the way for an entirely new conception of the significance of Isaiah's teachings.

Three things distinguish this commentary from its predecessors. *First*, Duhm attacked the literary sequences in the Book of Isaiah in a more determined way than had ever been done before. The book was analyzed into a large number of unrelated sections. This was in effect a return to the fragmentary hypothesis of Koppe and Eichhorn. But, as would be expected after nearly a century of study, Duhm's analysis was much more systematic and discriminating than that of the earlier critics. *Secondly*, in separating the fragments from one another, the principles of Hebrew poetry were employed. It was shown how changes in rhythm often concurred with a change of subject. The fragments stood out formally distinct from each other. A great gain! At this point Duhm revitalized the work of Lowth as he had revitalized the work of Eichhorn and Koppe. The great commentaries of the nineteenth century had given too little attention to the poetic structure of Isaiah's oracles. But Duhm saw, as his predecessors had not seen, the great importance of this criterion

for textual and even for historical criticism. The result of Duhm's analysis was to demonstrate more forcibly than had ever before been done that the Book of Isaiah is the product of centuries of compilers and editors. This had, of course, long been acknowledged to a certain extent, especially since the time of Stade, but it had commonly been supposed that Isaiah had a considerable share in the work. It had been tacitly assumed that Isaiah was an author; in Duhm's view Isaiah was a preaching prophet rather than a writing prophet, and took little pains to preserve his utterances.¹³ It follows that the more or less fragmentary oracles that have been preserved to us are not ordinarily to be interpreted by the contexts in which they now stand; the order and connection are secondary and artificial. Each fragment must be interpreted by itself. This principle is not stated by Duhm in so many words, but it underlies all his exegesis. *Thirdly*, closely connected with this more purely literary criticism is Duhm's historico-religious criticism. He supposes that the final redaction of the book was made largely in the interest of eschatological dogmas which prevailed among the Jews in the last two centuries before Christ. The eschatological problem which, though not always recognized, gave direction to the criticism of Isaiah, is now brought to the front with full consciousness of its central importance. In these three particulars—the adoption of the fragmentary hypothesis, the employment of the principles of Hebrew poetic form to support it, and the emphasis upon the eschatological problem—Duhm's commentary lays the foundation for the further development of criticism. It is beside our present purpose to exhibit all the results at which, in the employment of this method, Duhm arrives. We must confine our attention to those which bear directly upon the questions we have been considering.

If we turn to Duhm's criticism of chapters 28–33, we find that the unity of this section, which had been attacked at its end (chapters 32–33) and its beginning (chapter 28) by Stade and Giesebrecht, is now thoroughly shattered. The transitions from threats to promises in these chapters are recognized to be impossible,

¹³ Only chapters 6–8 and 28–31 (in their original form) are allowed to have been composed by Isaiah.

and the genuineness of many of the promissory passages is denied.¹⁴ They are held to represent a later eschatology than Isaiah's. The threatening nucleus of chapters 28-31 is placed in the time of Sennacherib (705-701), with Giesebrecht. On the other hand, most of the great anti-Assyrian prophecies are retained, and ascribed to the same period. The difficulty which Giesebrecht sought to avoid by assigning the anti-Assyrian predictions to an earlier period, Duhm attempts to dispose of in another way. He thinks that the threats in chapters 28-31 are directed publicly to the people, whereas the promises in these chapters whose genuineness he defends, and the promises in the anti-Assyrian group, are given privately to the Remnant. But there is no hint in these consolatory prophecies that they are addressed exclusively to an inner circle. Further, Duhm does not tell us how both the threats and the promises can be realized at the same time. If Zion is to be destroyed on account of the sinners, how is the righteous Remnant to be saved? If it is to be preserved for the sake of the Remnant, how are the sinners to be destroyed? Could not the ungodly also find refuge in Zion? As criticism advances, the contradiction between the eschatology of hope and the eschatology of doom becomes more and more apparent, and it would seem as if a choice between them must be made.

Again, Duhm takes the step in the criticism of the specifically Messianic prophecies for which Guthe and Giesebrecht had prepared the way. He treats 9 1 as a gloss, and thus breaks the one remaining link between the Messianic prophecy, 9 2-7, and chapters 7 and 8. This leaves 9 2-7 and its companion piece, 11 1 ff., without chronological anchorage. Duhm combines these two prophecies with 32 1-5, which he accepts as genuine, and 2 2-4, which is similar in form and feeling though not in subject-matter, and thinks that they were uttered toward the close of Isaiah's life; 9 2-7 is assigned to the time of Sennacherib's campaign; the other prophecies are placed vaguely in Isaiah's old age and regarded as "swan songs." Duhm's arguments for these dates are very inconclusive, and the real reason for attributing them to the

¹⁴ Among these are 28 5-6 (a gloss upon verses 1-4); 29 16-25; 30 18-26; 31 5-9, in its present form; chap. 33. On the other hand, 28 23-29; 29 5-8 (substantially); 30 27-33; and all of chap. 32 are accepted.

latest years of Isaiah's career would seem to be that Duhm is unable to find a convenient place for them anywhere else. This is not at all reassuring. If we can find a place for these prophecies, 9 2-7 excepted, only by locating them in a period of Isaiah's life about which nothing is known, the question inevitably arises, Are they prophecies of Isaiah at all? Thus in the criticism of the prophecies assigned to the time of Sennacherib and in the criticism of the Messianic prophecies, Duhm's positions cannot be regarded as final. They raise problems which they do not solve. In another respect Duhm leaves the student in doubt. His criterion for distinguishing between early and late eschatology is often vague. He holds that Isaiah was the creator of the eschatology of hope, and in consequence his eschatology is usually fluid in character, whereas the eschatology of the later writers is allusive, implying fixed dogmatic ideas. This criterion is interesting, but often fails to carry conviction. For example, it is difficult to see how Duhm can accept 32 15-20 or 30 27-33 but reject 30 18-26; or how he can accept the nucleus of 31 5-9 but reject 10 33 f. It would appear as if the passages which he accepts and those he rejects were often too similar in character to warrant such different treatment; and the question presses whether the disintegrating process which culminates in Duhm's commentary should be brought to a stop, and the passages which he rejects be defended on the basis of the passages which he accepts, or whether criticism should push still further and, on the basis of the passages which Duhm rejects, abandon many passages which he still accepts. The latter is the course which criticism actually took in the next stage of its development. The result was a new positive construction of the religious significance of Isaiah.¹⁵

It was Hackmann who laid the foundations for the new construction. His work was carried on by Cheyne, Brückner, and Volz. The capstone was placed upon it by Marti.¹⁶

¹⁵ In the criticism of chapters 36-37, the other main problem of Isa. 1-39, Duhm accepted Stade's results.

¹⁶ Cf. Hackmann, *Zukunftserwartungen des Jesaia* (1893); Cheyne, *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah* (1895); Brückner, *Die Composition des Buches Jesaia*, 28-33 (1897); Volz, *Die Vorexilische Jahwephropheie und der Messias* (1897); Marti, *Das Buch Jesaia* (1900).

In his literary criticism Hackmann agrees in general with Duhm though he arrived at his conclusions for the most part independently of Duhm. The methodical principle of his historical construction is that all investigation of Isaiah's eschatology, and for that matter of every problem connected with the book, must start from the prophecies which can be dated with tolerable certainty. The datable prophecies gather around the two great political crises in Isaiah's lifetime, the Syro-Ephraimite war in 735-734, and the revolt from Assyria and the campaign of Sennacherib in 705-701. It is to be assumed that in these crises the profoundest convictions of Isaiah would find classic expression. In chapters 6-8 are found the views of Isaiah, as developed in 735-734. In consequence of the refusal of Ahaz and the people to follow the prophet's counsels, his message at that time became a message of doom for both Israel and Judah. The only hopes which he cherished were concentrated upon his own immediate followers (8 16-18), who constitute the Remnant. With Duhm and Giesebrecht, Hackmann denied the Messianic character of Immanuel, and, with Duhm, he separated 9 2-7 from the preceding Syro-Ephraimite prophecies. Thus the eschatological outlook in 735-734 was, so far as the nation was concerned, pessimistic in the extreme.

The situation in 705-701 was analogous to the situation in 735-734. The people refused to follow Isaiah's warnings not to rely on Egypt, and again the prophet announced doom. The prophecies which most accurately reflect Isaiah's views at this time are found in chapters 28-33 (for the date, see Giesebrecht and Duhm). Hackmann completes the work of Duhm, and denies the genuineness of all the hopeful predictions in these chapters except 28 23-29 and 32 15-20 (!), these two passages being ascribed to other periods of Isaiah's life. What is left of chapters 28-33 is thus a series of denunciations and predictions of doom. But contrary to Isaiah's expectations—here Hackmann introduces an important variation—Jerusalem was delivered (*cf.* Stade and Duhm). The prophet interpreted this as a special dispensation of Jehovah, who thus sought to give a respite to his people that they might repent. But the people, whose heads were turned by the unexpected deliverance, far from amendment,

plunged into mad revelry, which drew from Isaiah his direst oracle (22 1-4), foretelling the utter destruction of the nation.¹⁷ The two groups, chapters 6-8, and 28-31 with 22, are thus the two foci from which Isaiah's eschatology is to be described.

Hackmann finds no period within the known lifetime of Isaiah in which the Messianic prophecies (9 2-7; 11 1 ff.; 32 1-5; 2 2-4) can be placed. Duhm had removed them to the last years of Isaiah's life; Hackmann finds this unsatisfactory, and pushes them beyond the prophet's horizon altogether. The argument against the genuineness of these prophecies is strengthened by several new and important considerations drawn from their character. The great anti-Assyrian prophecies, with their messages of encouragement, are either rejected or ignored, with the exception of chapters 10 and 18. These two chapters are placed between 705 and 701, but 18 is interpreted as a conditional promise (!), and the usual interpretation of 10, which infers from its denunciation of Assyria a deliverance for Jerusalem, is denied. Hackmann thus arrives at a consistent theory of Isaiah's eschatology. Beginning with some hope of a better future beyond the coming judgment, such as is expressed in 1 21-26 and 32 15-20 (!), Isaiah is convinced by the obstinacy of Ahaz that this expectation is vain, and the only hope he now allows himself is that expressed in 8 16-18, which concerns his immediate followers exclusively, and has nothing to do with the nation. The conviction of coming national disaster which was gained in 735-734 was intensified as time went on, till it reaches its climax in chapters 28-31 (expurgated of their consolatory sections) and 22. Instead of a prophet of eschatological hope, Isaiah has become in Hackmann's interpretation "a prophet of faith," who sets righteousness above patriotism, and, clinging to faith beyond the forms of faith, is ready to surrender his hope for the nation, and for Zion itself, with which the religion of Judah was so closely bound up. Thus, in the alternative, defined above, between the eschatology of doom and the eschatology of hope, Hackmann decides for the former. Of the four great eschatological doctrines in Isa. 1-39, the doctrines of the Day of the Lord and the Remnant are ac-

¹⁷ In dating 22 1-14 after the withdrawal of Sennacherib, Hackmann followed a suggestion of Soerensen.

cepted, and the doctrines of the invulnerability of Zion and the Messianic King are rejected. And it is interesting to note that the criticism which has led to this result leads also to a renewal of the emphasis upon the ethical and historical in Isaiah's teaching upon which Robertson Smith insisted, as against the supernatural and apocalyptic elements which Duhm had stressed.

Cheyne's *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah* (1895) followed closely along the lines of criticism marked out by Duhm and Hackmann, but with a preference at important points—for example, in the rejection of the Messianic prophecies—for Hackmann's results. The *Introduction* has the adventitious importance of being the first comprehensive work in English on the advanced criticism of Isaiah; but it was perhaps unfortunate that the task of introducing the newer criticism to English-speaking students should have devolved upon Professor Cheyne. His great learning is cordially recognized by all Old Testament scholars. He is the possessor of a literary style which lends charm to all that he writes. He has in an unusual degree the gift of exegetical divination—a divination which, unfortunately, in his "Jerahmeel" period borders on the mantic; but his logical faculty is deficient. He lacks the ability to present his evidence in a convincing way, and his readiness to assume the thing to be proved is almost unlimited. In the *Introduction* he adopts the plan of criticising the chapters of the book *seriatim*. The student is accordingly plunged *in medias res*, since the first chapter happens to present some of the most delicate problems of the book; and one who is not thoroughly familiar with previous criticism is likely to become bewildered. Phenomena whose critical significance would be readily understood if they were presented in their proper setting make no impression when viewed in the isolated way in which they must be considered when the present order of chapters is followed.

It might be thought that Cheyne's method is a proper application of the principle of induction, and adapted to clear his results from the suspicion of bias in favor of any particular theory of Isaiah's eschatology.¹⁸ But all fruitful induction starts from

¹⁸ This seems to be the author's own view of his work; see *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, col. 2184.

facts which are in themselves well ascertained, and whose significance can be fairly well understood, and, with the principles derived from these facts as a starting-point, the more complicated phenomena can be studied. This is the method of Hackmann, whose criticism thus takes on the form of a closely knit inductive argument, and in spite of incidental weaknesses proceeds with cumulative power. Not so in the case of Cheyne's *Introduction*. It is hardly more than a vast collection of more or less detached observations and suggestions, whose value is consequently obscured for those who are not already familiar with the criticism of the Book of Isaiah. In two respects, however, Cheyne goes beyond anything attempted by Duhamel or Hackmann, namely, in the development of the linguistic argument against suspected passages, and in the almost exhaustive collection of parallels in the later literature to the content of these passages. In the accumulation of linguistic evidence, Cheyne has expended his strength on a kind of proof the value of which is not estimated as highly as it used to be; but by his collection of parallels he has earned the gratitude of all subsequent investigators.

The scholars who carried on Hackmann's work in the most effective way were Brückner, Volz, and Marti. Brückner devoted himself to strengthening and refining Hackmann's criticism of Isa. 28-33, but his work does not compare with that of Volz in importance. Volz particularly assailed the genuineness of the Messianic passages, setting himself to prove that the idea of a Messianic king was alien not only to Isaiah's profoundest convictions, but to the most characteristic teachings of pre-exilic prophecy generally. If this can be demonstrated, the burden of proof rests upon those who defend the genuineness of the Messianic prophecies, and not upon those who reject them. There is a weakness in Volz's position, however, just at this point. He himself admits the presence of the Messianic idea, or at least of nearly related conceptions, in Jeremiah and Ezekiel, though, upon his thesis, these ideas agree with the ruling convictions of those prophets as little as the Messianic prophecies in Isaiah with his; and he tries to account for this by alleging that in the age of Jeremiah and Ezekiel the Messianic eschatology was in the air, and that the prophets were unconsciously influenced by

it. But, if so, may it not have been already in the air in Isaiah's day, and cannot Isaiah have been influenced by it in the same way? Volz gives no adequate consideration to this possibility, and until the question is settled his theory must be regarded as exposed to attack at a vulnerable point.

Marti, finally, sought to complete the criticism, begun by Stade, of the anti-Assyrian group of prophecies. He rejects all of them except chapters 10 and 18. By questionable criticism and exegesis he attempts to show that, in their original form, neither of these prophecies predicts the overthrow of Assyria, and hence that they do not imply the deliverance of Jerusalem; they give no support, therefore, to the opinion that, at one time in his life, Isaiah entertained a hopeful view of the future of Judah.

But the importance of Marti's commentary does not lie merely in its criticism of the anti-Assyrian prophecies. In it the criticism which we have been following since the time of Stade, and especially since Hackmann, reaches its logical conclusion. The commentary cannot be called an original work. It sets forth no new principles for the interpretation of Isaiah. In fertilizing power it is in marked contrast with Duhm's commentary. Marti's talent is for lucid exposition and orderly arrangement. He does not scintillate new ideas; he presents accepted ideas in clear and definite form. This estimate is not intended to depreciate the excellences of his commentary. Marti's special gifts of both analysis and synthesis are admirably displayed in it, and the volume is perhaps the best Baedeker which the student could have to the criticism of the past generation. The skill shown in handling the mass of matter accumulated by preceding scholars cannot be too highly praised. It is all analyzed with the greatest care, and the important things are brought out and disposed in a way that concentrates attention upon them. The eschatological problem, which we have seen to be the chief problem of the book, occupies the central place in the exposition. In the selection and arrangement of the material, and especially in the perfecting of the exegetical basis for the newer criticism, there is abundant opportunity for independence of judgment, if not for originality of conception, and independence of this kind the commentary unquestionably has.

Two fundamental propositions underlie Marti's work. The first is adopted from Hackmann: Isaiah "is not the prophet of eschatology, but the prophet of faith." By eschatology is here meant not the eschatology of doom, but the eschatology of hope, expressed most concretely in the two doctrines of the inviolability of Zion and the Messianic King. The second thesis, also, had been advanced by some of his predecessors, but the thoroughness with which it is applied is characteristic of Marti's commentary. This proposition is that down to the exile Isaiah's prophecies were preserved with but little change, except for accidental corruptions, but that in and after the exile extensive additions and interpolations were made to the collections of his oracles, in the spirit of the times, so that almost every prediction of doom now has its pendant of glowing promise. The reason for this can be readily understood. In the exilic and post-exilic periods, owing to the completely changed historical conditions the sense for the real meaning of pre-exilic prophecy was lost. The message of doom which was the heart, or, perhaps better, the conscience, of the earlier prophecy was no longer understood. What the people longed for, what they needed, under the foreign rule to which they were subject for centuries was a word of hope and courage. Now the interest of the scribes who collected and preserved the remains of the ancient literature that survived the catastrophe of the exile was not an antiquarian or historical interest; it was a religious interest. And to make pre-exilic prophecy religiously edifying to their contemporaries, the scribes used the predictions of national ruin, which had been fulfilled in the exile, as a dark background, against which the golden age to come shone out more glorious. Marti has endeavored to separate these two elements more consistently and completely than his predecessors, and this is one of the chief merits of his commentary. The following analysis, based on Marti, will enable the reader to see at a glance the results of criticism in this stage:—

I. ISAIAH I-XII

<i>Chapter</i>		<i>Chapter</i>
i	Judgment offset by ii, 2-4 (5)	Eschatological Hope ¹⁹
ii, 6-iv, 1	" "	iv, 2-6
v, 1-29	" "	v, 30
vi, 1-viii, 18 (19-21)	" "	ix, 1-7
ix, 8-x, 4	" "	x, 5-xii, 6
i-ix, as a whole, culminating in		x-xii

II. ISAIAH XIII-XXVII

xiii-xxiii, Judgments on the nations, culminating in xxiv-xxvii, Eschatological Judgment of the World.²¹

III. ISAIAH XXVIII-XXXV

xxviii, 1-4	Judgment offset by xxviii, 5-6	Eschatological Hope
xxviii, 7-22	" " xxviii, 23-29	" "
xxix, 1-4 (6)	" " xxix, 5, 7-8	" "
xxix, 9-15	" " xxix, 16-24	" "
xxx, 1-17	" " xxx, 18-26, 27-33	" "
xxxi, 1-4	" " xxxi, 5-9	" "
xxviii-xxxi, as a whole, culminating in xxxii-xxxiii,	Eschatological Appen-	
	dix I	
	xxxiv-xxxv, Eschatological Appen-	
	dix II	

IV. ISAIAH XXXVI-XXXIX

Narrative Section Eschatologized

It must not be supposed that the only work done on Isaiah in the twenty years from Stade to Marti was done by the school of advanced criticism whose history we have been following, but it can fairly be said that they have done nearly all the fruitful work, for it is they who have really grasped the problems of Isaiah

¹⁹ In attaching ii, 2-4 to chapter i, Marti follows Lagarde; i, 27 f., also, is an eschatological gloss.

²⁰ Isa. vi, 13b and vii, 15 are eschatological glosses, and viii, 8b-19 is an eschatological fragment offsetting viii, 5-8a.

²¹ Within chapters xiii-xxiii are various eschatological fragments or glosses, notably xiv, 24-27; xiv, 28-32 (especially verse 32); xvii, 12-14; and cf. xvii, 7 f.; xviii, 3, 5, 7.

and tried methodically to solve them. The hypothesis, more or less clearly defined, which has guided their investigation is that the present Book of Isaiah is the product of a long process of compilation, accretion, and redaction, and that even with the earliest collections of his oracles Isaiah had very little to do. When it is recognized that the present connections of the various oracles or groups of oracles are not original, the book falls apart into conflicting prophecies of threat and consolation, between which no sufficient transitions can be discovered. The next step is plain, namely, to deny the genuineness of the chief prophecies of consolation, for which no adequate occasion can be found in the historical situation in Isaiah's day, and which contradict the mission given to the prophet in his inaugural vision (Isa. 6).

If the position is to be successfully attacked, it must be in one or more of three ways: *First*, The attempt may be made to prove that the prophecies stand in the connections in which the prophet himself put them; and a hypothesis may be framed to explain the unmediated juxtaposition of doom and deliverance. *Secondly*, the question may be raised whether the eschatology of hope which recent critics ascribe to the post-exilic period accords in fact with the known eschatology of that period. If not, can the various elements in it be wrought into an organic unity with Isaiah's known eschatology of doom? *Finally*, if this cannot be done, is it possible to show that there was in Isaiah's day a popular eschatology, which Isaiah inherited, but did not succeed in fusing with his own ruling ideas? In that case the eschatology of hope found in the present form of Isaiah's prophecies might conceivably be genuine, even though not brought into organic relation with his other teachings. Isaiah would then be like Luther, whose original ideas radically conflicted with many of his inherited beliefs, though he himself was often unaware of the contradiction.

Most of the commentaries and introductions that appeared between 1880 and 1900, and even down to the present time, have either ignored the problems raised by recent criticism or have been contented with animadverting upon points of detail, without a thorough discussion of its fundamental principles. For this reason these works are, for the most part, of subordinate interest,

and a detailed criticism of them in this article is unnecessary.²² But before proceeding to the next definite stage something should be said about some important monographs and essays upon the narrative section of Isaiah (chapters 36–38) and upon the anti-Assyrian prophecies.²³ Winckler adopted Stade's analysis of the narrative chapters (Isa. 36–39) with some modifications, but advanced the theory that there were two campaigns of Sennacherib against Judah, a successful one in 701, to which 2 Kings

²² The following representative commentaries and introductions cited by the names of their authors may be mentioned. Cheyne (1880, 5th ed. 1890), suggestive of what was to come, but now largely antiquated; Bredenkamp (1886–87) and Orelli (1887, 3d ed. 1904), representatives of the strict conservative position; Delitzsch (4th ed. 1889), because of the piety and learning of its author, exerted an important influence in recommending the older criticism to timid students, but shows little apprehension of the fundamental problems of the book, which are too often glossed over by means of a somewhat sentimentalizing exegesis; Dillmann (5th ed. 1890), a lineal descendant of Ewald, and the best representative of the older critical position, characterized by solid learning, a thesaurus of the history of criticism and exegesis, but with a strong tendency toward harmonizing exegesis; the sixth edition (1908), edited by Kittel, has all the merits of the fifth, with important concessions to recent criticism, a work of permanent value; G. A. Smith (*Expositor's Bible*, 1889), a work of great originality and inspiration, which has perhaps done more to interest the lay reader and the preacher in Isaiah than any other work, but the glowing imagination which has accomplished this tends to fuse many sections of Isaiah into a false unity, and thus obscures the real problems of the book; Skinner (*Cambridge Bible*, 1896) and Whitehouse (*Century Bible*, 1905), two works whose value is not to be judged by their limited scope, both representing the principles of the older criticism; Skinner's introduction, an admirable exposition of Isaiah's religious significance on the basis of these principles; Whitehouse, to be especially commended for its wealth of archaeological illustration; Box (1908), an excellent translation in metrical form, with brief but illuminating introductions, and notes to the several prophecies, embodying the principles of Duhm and Cheyne; a handbook of results, not of processes; McFadyen (*Bible for Home and School*), elementary; Wade (*Westminster Commentaries*, 1911), a fair commentary of the reproductive kind, showing incidental traces of Duhm's exegesis, but making no very positive contribution to the subject; Kuenen's *Introduction* (*Onderzoek*, 1889), an admirable, condensed exposition of the older critical views of Isaiah, regarding many of Stade's positions as hypercriticism; Driver (*Literature of the Old Testament*, 1891) maintains the older critical positions; in the revised edition (6th ed. 1897) he describes many of the results of recent criticism, but occupies a very reserved attitude toward them; Cornill's *Introduction* (English trans., 1907) may be said, in general, to occupy Duhm's standpoint, but the discussions are not at all exhaustive.

²³ Winckler, *Alttestamentliche Untersuchungen* (1892); Meinhold, *Die Jesaiaerzählungen, Jes. 36–39* (1898); Nagel, *Der Zug des Sanherib gegen Jerusalem* (1902); Prášek, *Sanheribs Feldzüge gegen Juda* (1903); to which I venture to

18 13-16 refers, and a second, which ended in a great disaster, after 691. This theory is defended by Prášek and in my own essay. Meinhold and Nagel reject this theory, but differ in their judgments on the narratives. Meinhold, on the ground of 2 Kings 18 13-16 and Sennacherib's own inscriptions, denies the historical credibility of the accounts, while Nagel defends it. The importance of the subject lies in its bearing upon the group of anti-Assyrian prophecies. If Isa. 36 and 37 relate to the campaign of 701 and are substantially trustworthy—that is, if there was a signal deliverance of Jerusalem at that time—and if Isaiah's threats and promises at that time are both accepted as genuine, then the promises were confirmed by the event, and the threats were not. If the signal deliverance in 701 is admitted, and the genuineness of the promises in 701 is denied, then Isaiah must be regarded as having been agreeably disappointed by the outcome (Hackmann). If, on the other hand, it is denied that there was any remarkable deliverance in 701, the threats were fulfilled, and the promises were not. This is the view of Meinhold, who accepts both groups of prophecies, and thinks that Isa. 36-37 has been made to agree with Isaiah's prophecies of deliverance. If the signal deliverance is denied and the consolatory prophecies are rejected, then there is perfect agreement between the situation in 701 and Isaiah's attitude toward it. Finally, if there were two campaigns, a successful one in 701 and a disastrous one after 691, it is conceivable that Isaiah's prophecies of doom may date from 701 and his prophecies of promise from the later period. In view of these various possibilities the problem of the narrative section in Isaiah is, as Meinhold contends, fundamental to any sound criticism of Isaiah's prophecies in 701.

Wilke and Küchler take up the other side of the problem, and discuss the attitude of Isaiah toward Assyria generally. Wilke denies the present sequences in the Book of Isaiah, but adopts a conservative position with respect to the anti-Assyrian prophecies. His discussion is very well arranged, and for that very reason the weaknesses in his position can be the more readily detected.

add my own essay, *The Invasion of Sennacherib*, *Bibliotheca Sacra* (1906); Wilke, *Jesaia und Assur* (1905); Küchler, *Die Stellung des Propheten Jesaia zur Politik seiner Zeit* (1906); Staerk, *Das assyrische Weltreich im Urteil der Propheten* (1908), (not accessible to me).

Küchler accepts in general the critical position of Duhm, but denies totally the trustworthiness of chapters 36–37. In consequence he must hold that Isaiah's expectations as expressed, for example, in chapter 10 were grievously disappointed.²⁴ In addition to the above essays, attention should be called to four other monographs which treat of various phases of our problem.²⁵ Meinhold's monograph on the Remnant is reactionary as compared with recent critical theories. It is a strange mixture of acute incidental exegesis and impossible combinations. For example, to explain how the righteous can be saved in Jerusalem while the wicked are destroyed—the question in which his essay really culminates—he suggests that the ungodly went out of the city to the war against Sennacherib (pp. 156 ff.). In Guthe's most recent exposition of Isaiah's teachings his earlier untenable theories are abandoned. He strongly inclines to the results of Hackmann and Marti, but finds in 28 16 and 1 21–26 evidence that toward the end of his life Isaiah entertained the hope of a national restoration—something that Hackmann will not allow. The Messianic passages are relegated to an appendix. This disposition of them is intended to manifest Guthe's serious doubt of their genuineness, though he is not quite prepared to reject them. The reader cannot find a more admirably balanced résumé of the chief results of modern criticism than Guthe's little book. Kennett's theory is that the present Book of Isaiah was compiled in the Maccabaeian age, and that many of the prophecies in chapters 1–39 originated in that time—an extreme development of Duhm's opinion.

In the works just described no new principles of criticism or

²⁴ Küchler's monograph is also important for its polemic against another thesis of Winckler propounded in his *Geschichte Israels* (1895) and in his *Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*, namely, that the eighth-century prophets were largely actuated in their attitude toward Assyria by political considerations. Küchler shows conclusively that Isaiah, at least, was governed exclusively by religious and idealistic motives.

²⁵ Meinhold, *Studien zur israelitischen Religionsgeschichte*, Bd. I, *Der heilige Rest* (1903); Guthe, *Jesaia (Religionsgeschichtliche Volksbücher, 1907)*; Kennett, *The Composition of the Book of Isaiah* (1910); Nowack, *Die Zukunftshoffnungen Israels in der assyrischen Zeit* (*Festschrift Holtzmann, 1902*, inaccessible to me).

interpretation are advanced, but only fresh exegetical or critical combinations, based on the general principles either of the earlier or the recent critical school. We have now to turn to a new formulation of the problem which definitely marks the third stage in the latest period of criticism. The parentage of the idea is to be imputed to Gunkel. In his *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit* (1895) he proved that in many passages in the Bible, and particularly in the first chapter of Genesis, there are borrowings, reminiscences, or allusions which can be traced to The Babylonian Cosmogonic Poems. The method he pursued was to take many phrases, words, and ideas in the Bible, and show that by themselves they are unintelligible; to be understood, they must be set in a larger context. The Babylonian Creation epic furnishes this context. In the application of this method it appeared that many ideas which now are found only in late portions of the Bible and which, for this reason, were supposed to be themselves late, had a long antecedent history in Hebrew literature or tradition. Gunkel himself suggested that the same method should be applied to the subject of Israelite eschatology generally, and in (Bousset und Gunkel) *Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments*, Heft 1 (1903), he sketched out a history of the eschatological idea of the Day of the Lord on the basis of this new method of research. But it remained for Gressmann in his *Ursprung der israelitisch-jüdischen Eschatologie* (1906) to subject for the first time the whole problem of Old Testament eschatology to a re-examination in the light of Gunkel's new method. The result for the criticism and interpretation of Isaiah was extraordinary.

We have seen how Duhm considered Isaiah to be the real founder of the eschatology of hope; and how, on the other hand, Hackmann, Cheyne, Volz, and Marti sought to show that the eschatology of hope was irreconcilable with the eschatology of doom proclaimed by Isaiah; and, further, how from the contradiction between the two sets of ideas they drew the conclusion that the eschatology of hope could not have originated with Isaiah, but must have arisen later. Gressmann grants the premise of these critics, namely, that there is no organic connection between the eschatology of doom and the eschatology of hope,

but he denies their conclusion. He raises the question whether the eschatology of hope may not be earlier than Isaiah, earlier than the prophecy of the eighth century altogether. If it were so, these prophets might have accepted the eschatology of hope as a part of their traditional faith notwithstanding the fact that it could not be combined with the eschatology of doom in an organic unity (see above, p. 504). The way in which Gressmann works out this point is very interesting; but only the briefest outline of his argument is here possible.

There are, according to Gressmann, three ways in which the existence of a preprophetic eschatology may be established: *First*, It may be inferred from the prophetic polemic; the prophetic antithesis implies a preprophetic thesis. *Secondly*, it may be inferred from those eschatological views which are not organically related to the fundamental convictions of the prophets, but stand in a more or less manifest contradiction to them. *Thirdly*, it may be inferred from conceptions or phrases which are not of themselves intelligible, and hence imply an antecedent history. By evidence of this kind Gressmann first seeks to establish the existence of a preprophetic eschatology of doom. Here he has his strongest case. It must be admitted that the Day of the Lord in Amos (5 18) is already a standing phrase. He uses it without explaining it, assuming that his hearers would understand it. The idea of the Day of the Lord must therefore be older than Amos. What is its history? What was understood by the phrase? If we turn to Zephaniah, the Day of the Lord appears as a cosmical catastrophe (1 2 ff., 18). According to the modern critical school (cf. Stade) Zephaniah was the first prophet to conceive the Day of the Lord as a cosmical catastrophe. But this position is untenable, since the conception in Zephaniah is altogether vague, not concrete and definite as we should expect if it was original with him. How the catastrophe is to come about is not clearly explained; contrast Zeph. 1 18 with 1 16. Moreover, Zephaniah is not the first prophet to express the conception of a cosmical catastrophe: it is plainly implied in the earlier prophets (see Amos 8 9; Hos. 4 2; and above all Isa. 2). But it did not originate with any one of these prophets; their conception is no more coherent than Zephaniah's. Finally, the idea of a cosmical catastrophe is itself

a mythical idea, and as such prehistoric; it cannot, therefore, have originated with the prophets.²⁶

Gressmann surmises that in the development of the idea of the Day of the Lord there were three stages. There was, first, the mythical stage, in which some physical disaster, such as a flood or a fire or an earthquake, must have been in mind. In support of this assumption the prophecies against the heathen nations are alleged. The doom denounced in these prophecies upon all nations presupposes the idea of a cosmical catastrophe. The second was the popular Israelite stage, in which the primitive notion became blurred and indefinite, as we now find it reflected in the prophets, and at the same time the catastrophe was limited to the nations, whereas Israel was to escape. This stage may be inferred from the polemic of Amos (see Amos 5 18 ff.). Finally, there is the prophetic stage, in which the idea of the Day of the Lord is historical and moral. The Day of the Lord is a day of destruction, not solely for the enemies of Israel, but for Israel itself, because of its sins. This destruction is to be accomplished by a foreign foe—the Assyrians or the Chaldaeans, the Persians, the Syrians, as the case may be. The natural convulsions, therefore, which are described in Isa. 2 or in Zephaniah, are not to be taken in the original mythological sense. The prophets are speaking of the destruction of Israel by the kingdoms which Jehovah commissioned to execute his judgment. Yet the convulsions of nature are not to be interpreted allegorically any more than literally. They are nothing more than poetic formulas which the prophets borrow from the past to heighten the mysterious and awful effect of their predictions of doom. They describe the historical ruin of the nation poetically in the terms of the old mythical catastrophe.

In the same way, Gressmann tries to reconstruct a preprophetic eschatology of hope. In the pictures of the Golden Age, for example, there are many traits which would not naturally be suggested to the prophet's mind by the historical situation and the needs of the people. The predictions of freedom from foreign

²⁶ Gressmann argues, further, that Palestine was physically not the kind of a land in which the idea of cosmical catastrophe would be likely to arise, and infers from this that the whole notion is foreign.

oppression, restoration from exile, and the like, may be so explained, but others cannot be. The covenant with the beasts of the field (Hos. 2 20), or the idyllic description of peace in nature (Isa. 11 6-8), can only be explained by mythology. This is corroborated by analogies in other literatures. Thus the notion of the harmlessness of the wild beasts is especially associated in classical mythology with the animals that dwell in sacred groves—a garden of the gods. It is easy to imagine that the same notion existed in Hebrew mythology in connection with Paradise, the Garden of the Lord (Ezek. 28 13), and to infer that the Golden Age to come, in such passages as Isa. 11 6-8, is painted in the colors of Paradise. Similarly, such imaginative pictures of a transformed nature as those in Isa. 41 18-20; 48 21; 55 12 ff. may best be explained as derived from a myth of a restored Eden. This conjecture is supported by Isa. 51 3, where the new Jerusalem is described as Eden. It is not said in this passage that Eden itself will return, but Jerusalem is described in the terms of a restored Eden. The descriptions in Deutero-Isaiah thus disclose an old mythological background; but the prophet uses mythical features in a purely poetical way, to paint the glory of the restored Jerusalem, just as the mythical features of the eschatology of doom were seen to have lost their original meaning and to have become traditional poetic imagery. This use of mythological description is characteristic of “the prophetic style.”

In the same way it is argued that the references to milk in Joel 3 18, where the figure is by no means self-explanatory, and to milk and honey in Isa. 7 15-21 are in origin mythical. In other religions milk and honey are the food of the gods; their natural place is in a description of the abundance of a garden of the gods. The phrase, “a land flowing with milk and honey,” does not occur in the Hebrew stories of Paradise, but is a standing hyperbole for the productiveness of Palestine. Originally, however, it must have had a mythological connotation.²⁷ Gressmann contends that these prophecies and phrases, and many others of similar character, can best be explained by the hypothesis that there was an old myth of an eschatological Eden, the counterpart of the primitive Eden. But if the prophecies of eschatological hope

²⁷ Gressmann, *op. cit.*, p. 212.

have a mythical background, the eschatology of hope, as well as the eschatology of doom, is prehistoric, and therefore preprophetic. By similar combinations he endeavors to establish the preprophetic origin of the idea of the Messianic King.

It must be admitted, I think, that Gressmann makes a very strong argument for the preprophetic origin both of the eschatology of doom and the eschatology of hope. Its real force can scarcely be estimated from the brief résumé given above. But granted that he establishes this part of his case, the genuineness of the hopeful prophecies in Isaiah is not thereby proved. It is quite conceivable that Isaiah may have adopted and modified the eschatology of doom without at the same time adopting the eschatology of hope, as indeed Gressmann himself admits that the pre-exilic prophets, as contrasted with the post-exilic prophets, were stormy petrels, whose main message was one of warning. In favor of such a supposition it may be urged that the eschatology of hope has not been made moral and historical in any such degree as the eschatology of doom. Yet why should not the prophets have been able to spiritualize the former as they transformed the latter? Gressmann's theory is that the eschatology of hope in the prophets is an unwilling concession to the popular preprophetic eschatology. But why was it necessary for them to make such concessions? Finally, the contradiction between the eschatology of doom and the eschatology of hope in the present form of the prophecies remains—a contradiction which Gressmann admits. All this would seem to make strongly against the genuineness of the eschatology of hope in Isaiah, even supposing it to be established that its ideas were current before his day. It is conceivable that the pre-exilic prophets resisted the popular eschatology of promise,²⁸ while the later prophets, under changed conditions, were more tolerant of it.

Gressmann has an extremely ingenious way of getting around these difficulties. He reminds us that the myth of a cosmic catastrophe which is supposed to lie behind the eschatology of doom and the myth of an eschatological Eden which is supposed to lie behind the eschatology of hope are both purely hypothetical. As

²⁸ Gressmann even conjectures that this optimistic outlook was cultivated in the schools of the "false prophets."

a matter of fact, no such myths have been discovered. They are matters of inference;²⁹ but Gressmann is sure of his inferences. He next assumes that these myths had been sundered in very early times, before they became known to the Israelites. They had once stood in an organic relation to each other; but this relation had been broken, and all memory of it had disappeared in remote times. The lack of connection between the eschatology of hope and the eschatology of doom which recent critics have made so much of, and which Gressmann admits, is to be explained by this early sunderance and disintegration of the great pair of eschatological myths. The unmediated juxtaposition of hope and doom in our prophetic books is but the inheritance from an already disjointed past. The juxtaposition of contradictory utterances thus becomes a feature of "prophetic style" once more, a convention of prophetic writing.

For this very subtle theory Gressmann thinks he can offer proof in one striking instance, namely, in the prophetic doctrine of the Remnant. Did the idea of the Remnant originally belong to the eschatology of doom or to the eschatology of hope? To the eschatology of doom, unquestionably, answers Gressmann. The Remnant implies a catastrophe, and was originally intended to emphasize the greatness of the catastrophe (see Amos 3 12; 5 2 f.; Isa. 6 11 ff.; 17 5 ff.). But in the prophets the Remnant is incorporated into the eschatology of hope. This reversal of significance was not made by the prophets themselves; for, when they speak of the Remnant, they assume that their hearers will apprehend the word as they do—the hope of the future is lodged in this Remnant. Thus Isaiah gives no explanation of the name of his son, Shear-jashub; he expects the people to understand the allusion.³⁰ Similarly Amos alludes to the Remnant of Joseph (Amos 5 14 ff.) without explaining it. If we may infer from the way in which Amos speaks of the Day of the Lord that his contemporaries were familiar with the idea and the phrase, it may on the same grounds be inferred that they were familiar with the idea of the Remnant.

²⁹ Gressmann is here at a decided disadvantage as compared with Gunkel. In *Schöpfung und Chaos* Gunkel had a real myth to start with, whose existence in the earliest times could be proved; Gressmann has none.

³⁰ Scholars have often conjectured that Isaiah explained the name in some prophecy now lost.

The transition from the eschatology of doom to the eschatology of hope through the change in the significance of the Remnant was not an original transition. An organic connection between the two eschatologies is not established in this way. The idea of the Remnant naturally belongs to the eschatology of doom. It can be transformed into hope only when the Remnant is identified with Israel. This is not explicitly done by the prophets, which shows that they did not originate this new conception of the Remnant, but adopted it from the popular eschatology. But if the Prophets could in this instance adopt the popular eschatology of hope, although it had no organic connection with the eschatology of doom, there is no objection in principle to supposing that they adopted other elements of the popular eschatology. "With the idea of the Remnant [interpreted as a hope], the rigid eschatology of doom is broken through. A breach is now made, through which the entire eschatology of hope, or at least a great part of it, can enter. . . . It must also be borne in mind that the material was traditional, and could therefore be handed on, without much concern about its consistency" (p. 243).

Gressmann consequently lays down the following canon for the criticism of the prophets: "The sole warrantable criterion upon which the genuineness of an eschatological passage may be denied is the contemporary historical situation presupposed in it. So long as this is not irreconcilable with the ascription of the passage to the author in whose book the prediction of future salvation (*die Heilseschatologie*) has come down to us, so long its genuineness may be maintained" (p. 243). Thus the criterion of religious ideas, which recent critics made the chief ground for denying the genuineness of the eschatological passages in Isaiah, is formally rejected by Gressmann.

Gressmann did not propound his theories in an apologetic interest; in fact, in the form in which he presents them they are radical in the extreme. The genuineness of the Messianic passages is indeed rehabilitated, but at what a price! They are the outgrowth of an alien mythology. As it was to be expected, however, Gressmann's rejection of the principles which have guided critics for a generation and his novel solution of the problems of the book were turned to account by scholars of a more con-

servative temper. In *Der alttestamentliche Prophetismus* (1912) Sellin attempted to re-establish, on the basis of Gressmann's work, something very much like the old orthodox doctrine of Messianic prophecy. He denied, of course, that the eschatological ideas were derived from a foreign mythology, and tried to show that they all had their source in the revelation of Jehovah at Sinai. Mythical traits, the presence of which he admits, are only embellishments, borrowed from kindred ideas in other nations, and do not affect the substance of Israelite eschatology. With the work of Sellin criticism would seem to have boxed the compass, and to incline once more to positions held before 1880.

I have contented myself with giving only a résumé of Gressmann's positions so far as they bear upon the genuineness of Isaiah's prophecies, without going into a criticism of these positions which would be likely to lead rather far afield. But the reader ought fully to realize what an enormous drain upon his speculative faculty is required by Gressmann. It must be *assumed* (1) that there were originally two clearly defined eschatological myths, one of a world catastrophe, one of a restored Eden, for which there is no historical evidence but which are admittedly only matters of inference; (2) that these two hypothetical myths were once organically connected; (3) that before they entered into Israel the connection between them was forgotten, and that each myth became so disintegrated that at present we have only fragments of them left; (4) that the prophets adopted these *disjecta membra* from the popular uncanonical eschatology, but that, while they were able to ethicize the myth of doom, they were not able to ethicize the myth of hope, at least to the same degree (why not?); (5) that the prophets made no attempt to join together again the two hypothetical myths once hypothetically connected, but left the fragments in the same disjointed state in which they found them, except for the artificial and inadequate connection supplied at times (not always) by the doctrine of the Remnant. In spite of Gressmann's genius for brilliant combination, in spite of the great suggestiveness of his work, in spite even of the probability that there *was* a preprophetic eschatology of some sort, for the establishment of which thesis the greatest credit is due to Gressmann, yet when his theory is allowed

to stand out stark and stripped of incidental protecting exegesis, its inner weakness is revealed. The defence of Isaiah's prophecies by such a purely conjectural construction is precarious. Yet Gressmann has struck out a new mode of attacking the problem which may lead to important results.

From this survey of the history of criticism we turn to the most recent contribution to the voluminous literature on Isaiah, the commentary of Professor Gray.

Commentaries may be of two kinds, creative, of which small class Duhm's is a conspicuous example, or reproductive, like Marti's. The commentary of Professor Gray belongs to the latter type. From what has been said above about Marti the reader will understand that this implies no disparagement of Professor Gray's work. There is ample room in a reproductive commentary for learning, acumen, and independent judgment, and the volume before us exhibits all these qualities.

In the Introduction Gray adopts the three fundamental principles of the modern critical school, namely, that the Book of Isaiah is a collection of oracles of widely diverse age and character; that the oracles are in poetical form, and that differences of form often enable us to determine the limits of a prophecy or to recognize interpolations; and that in the outlook upon the future, types characteristic of earlier and later periods respectively may be discriminated.

On the first point he remarks: "The fact that the Book of Isaiah is not the work of the prophet Isaiah³¹ but a post-exilic compilation, ought to be the starting-point in all detailed criticism, or interpretation of the Book" (p. xxxii). In a continuous work, like the history of Thucydides, the presumption is always in favor of the genuineness of any section, but this presumption does not hold in a compilatory work; "each piece must be judged by itself." On p. xcvi Gray turns this principle against Gressmann's canon, that the historical background of a prophecy is the only legitimate criterion for the determination of its genuineness.

³¹ "Prophet of Isaiah" is a misprint. Other misprints noticed are "Chs. 28-32" for 28-33 (p. xlvii); "unlike" for alike, p. 32; "Cheyne, p. 29" for p. 27 (p. 110); "vv. 18-23" for 19-23 (p. 157); "8a-10" for 8c-10 (p. 148); "prophetic" for *antiprophetic* (p. 377, line 11). The last mistake results in a serious misunderstanding of the view criticised.

This assumes that the presumption is always in favor of the genuineness of a prophecy which is contained in a book bearing a prophet's name; but in a compilation there is no such presumption. In general, Gray does not seem to have been much impressed by Gressmann's discoveries.

In regard to the age of the compilation, Gray does not follow Duhm and the more radical critics in putting it in the Maccabaeian period. Against so late a date he argues from the history of the canon, and especially from the age of the Greek translation. Here Gray puts the case admirably. The Maccabaeian theory is based on one of several possible interpretations of a number of prophecies; and "a possible, but not necessary, theory of the interpretation and origin of a section may rightly be judged unproven if it conflicts with the probable, even though not certain, history of the prophetic Canon" (p. xlv). Gray himself inclines to a date toward the close of the third century B.C.³² His criticism of Kennett (p. lix) is just and trenchant.

The discussion of the poetic form of the prophecies (pp. lix-lxviii) is also excellent. In a former number of the *Harvard Theological Review*³³ the attempt was made to apprise the reader of the state of this question at the present time. It is a pleasure to be able to refer him now to Gray's elucidation of the subject. It would be hard to find anything in brief compass more informing and satisfactory. In general it may be said that the poetical analyses of the various prophecies are among the strongest features of the book, and in this respect Gray has made a distinct advance upon the commentaries of Duhm and Marti. In keeping with the general scheme of the *Hand-Commentar*, Marti did not give a continuous translation of the prophecies. His results are therefore not apparent to the eye, and not easily judged. Duhm translates in metrical form, but practically says to the reader, "Trust my ear." He seldom seeks to justify his views of the poetical structure of the prophecies. Gray, on the other hand, has adopted a system by which the phenomena are made clear even to a student unacquainted with Hebrew, and the impartial way in which this is done cannot be too highly commended.

³² A concise and clear statement of the author's theory of the successive stages in the formation of the book will be found in § 40 (pp. lv-lvii).

³³ Vol. V (1912), pp. 86 ff.

Most writers are so in love with their metrical schemes that they find it hard to resist the temptation to gloss over difficulties in the application. Gray always apprises the reader at the outset of the actual facts of the case, so that an opportunity is given to judge of the aptness of the metrical emendations he proposes.

In another connection (pp. liii-lv), Gray discusses the important question of the relation of the present form of the prophecies to the spoken word. His opinion is that the bulk of the [genuine] prophecies in the Book of Isaiah "are condensations into artistic poetic form of what Isaiah had said in public at greater length, but without the same restraint of form." This would seem to imply after all that Isaiah was an author. Just what effect this theory would ultimately have on the theory of the composition of the book, Gray does not tell us. This particular subject has not yet been sufficiently investigated. Thus far the Introduction has given clear, balanced, and sufficiently complete statements of the problems of the book. When we come to the eschatological question, however, the treatment is less satisfactory.³⁴

Gray recognizes that it should be one of the main aims of a commentary on Isaiah to "disengage the work of that prophet from the later accretions which it has received, and so to recover . . . the spirit and teaching of a single personality in place of the confused and composite form that must present itself, if we attempt to treat the entire book as the work of a single hand" (p. xi). But it is also an important part of his task "to do justice to the other contributors to the book, and, above all, to approach with sympathy the work of, perhaps, many nameless writers that now forms a large part of it" (p. xii). These represent the convictions and hopes of the post-exilic Jewish church, and as such are of the greatest significance.

Of the first part of this double task Gray acquits himself in §§ 74-89, "Isaiah as Prophet and Teacher" (pp. lxxxi-xcvi). The second part, an examination of the religious ideas and expectations of the other contributors to the book, is touched upon only

³⁴ In passing, one inexplicable omission should be noted. In §§ 58-73, "Isaiah in relation to the political and social conditions of his age," there is no reference to Hezekiah's reforms. Since the attempt has often been made to connect the prophecies of hope in one way or another with these reforms, a discussion of their date and character is of great importance.

incidentally in the volume before us; it is to be hoped that it is the author's intention to treat this subject connectedly, including the eschatology of these authors, in the Introduction to the second volume. Otherwise, a serious omission in the Commentary would have to be recorded.

The survey of Isaiah's work as prophet and teacher will be disappointing to a reader who looks for an exposition of the development of Isaiah's ideas and expectations. After saying that the supreme interest in the study of Isaiah is to discover what he had himself learned from God, what he taught his own age, and what through it he has contributed to man's increasing knowledge and consciousness of God, Gray continues (p. lxxxiii):

These questions can be answered up to a certain point; but, owing to the uncertainty that hangs over many questions of the literary origin of much of Isa. 1 1-39, . . . they cannot with advantage be pursued into the detail that has sometimes been attempted. Here, at all events, no fresh elaborate attempt will be made to trace development in Isaiah's conceptions and teaching, to bring to light conflicting conceptions in his view of the future, for example, or in his judgment of Assyria, and then to determine the chronological sequence of the changes. All the more elaborate structures of Isaiah's "theology" rest of necessity on shifting and insecure foundations; even if it were certain, and it is not, that passages such as 11 1-8; 9 1-6; 32 1-8 were the work of Isaiah at all, it is altogether uncertain at what period of his life he composed them, and how he came by, or how he modified, his conceptions of a Messiah.

I have given this quotation at length, because I believe it discloses the principal defect of the book. The author declines at the outset the attempt to solve the chief problem of Isaiah. He does not shun the task of improving on the metrical analyses of his predecessors, although the greatest uncertainty exists about the structure of Hebrew poetry; why should he refuse the obligation to formulate the eschatological problem more precisely, even if he feels that the critical foundations are "shifting and insecure"? If they are so, it is the first business of the critic to try to make them more stable and secure. As a matter of fact, Gray inclines, though it is an irresolute and swaying inclination, to that wing of the modern school of which Hackmann and Marti are the most conspicuous representatives (see especially his treatment of the

Messianic prophecies); but, in consequence of the over-cautious attitude avowed in the paragraph quoted above, the formulation of the eschatological problem, instead of being more precise and sharply defined than it was by Hackmann and Marti, is much vaguer and more blurred. My criticism is not directed against Gray's opinion that the eschatological problem is as yet not satisfactorily solved; it is that his commentary does not make as plain as those of his predecessors what, exactly, the elements of the problem are. I do not demand that he should decide among rival theories, but that a commentary at this date in the history of criticism should exhibit fully and clearly the different theories, with the critical and exegetical arguments by which they are supported or confuted, and the consequences that follow from them.

One example of the shortcomings of Gray's commentary in these respects must suffice. Isaiah 22 1-14 has been a cornerstone in many constructions of the eschatology of Isaiah. The first question is whether the passage is a description of what has occurred or a prediction of what will occur. Since the time of Soerensen a favorite theory has been that the passage is historical. This opinion is based mainly on verses 8-11 (and verses 6-7), which can hardly be construed otherwise than as historical, and on the prevalence of perfect tenses throughout the rest of the passage. But, if historical, the most natural place to put the prophecy is after the invasion of Sennacherib in 701. From this a very interesting inference is drawn: the last datable utterance of Isaiah is a prophecy of unmitigated doom, and the prophet's life closes as it began (see chapter 6) without hope for his nation. This is a fundamental point in Hackmann's construction, and when Isa. 22 is associated with chapters 28-31 (rejecting the consolatory pendants), which are prior to the arrival of the Assyrians before Jerusalem, we have a consistently gloomy series of prophecies from the time of Sennacherib.

There is a difficulty, however, in the way of this date for chapter 22. If we turn to verses 1-5 with the reference to the Day of the Lord (22 5), and to verses 12-14 which announce disaster for sin (see verse 14b), we are evidently in a time before disaster. This also best suits the careless attitude of the people. These verses are interpreted by Hackmann as expressing the frivolous joy of the

people after the final withdrawal of Sennacherib. In that case the destruction which is announced cannot refer to the invasion of Sennacherib, but must mean some other, undefined destruction in the future. But this does not seem to be the natural interpretation of the passage. Consequently, Duhm, on the ground of verses 1-5 and 12-14, puts the prophecy at the beginning of the revolt against Sennacherib, when the people were confident of the result of the new Egyptian alliance. The objection to this view is that verses 8-11 (6 f.), which are almost certainly historical, imply a time of the greatest distress and anxiety in the recent past, such as must have been caused by the appearance of Sennacherib under the walls of Jerusalem. Accordingly, we have a third theory, represented by Robertson Smith and Dillmann. This theory puts the prophecy in the midst of the campaign, after the humiliation of Hezekiah (2 Kings 18 13-16) and the supposed temporary withdrawal of Sennacherib, but before the final retirement of the Assyrians. This theory would account for verses 8-12 (6-7) as recalling the anxiety of the people at the approach of Sennacherib; for verses 1-5 and 12-14 as the result of the feeling of relief that ensued upon his temporary withdrawal; and for the stern warning of the prophet, who looked for a return of the foe. But the combination assumes the substantial truth of the narrative in Isa. 36 f. Another objection to it is the difficulty of finding a place for chapter 10, which is usually assigned to the same period. The only remaining possibility is to give up the unity of the section, and remove verses 8-11, and possibly verses 6-7. Then the passage can be placed most fittingly at the beginning of the Egyptian alliance, when perhaps, as Duhm suggests, Padi, the loyal king of Ekron, had been brought in irons to Hezekiah for safe-keeping.³⁵ Such is the problem of Isa. 22 1-14. It is seen to involve the credibility of chapters 36-37; and through its relation to chapters 28-31, on the one hand, and to chapter 10, on the other, the passage is of fundamental importance for the question what Isaiah, in the time of Sennacherib's invasion, expected the outcome to be.

Let us see how Gray treats this problem. The people of Jerusalem may have given themselves up to revelry, "either because they do not perceive the issue of things, and see in a tem-

³⁵ See Sennacherib's inscriptions.

porary alleviation a permanent relief, or because, feeling the insecurity of the present, they are determined to drown their cares in wine and feasting (verse 13 f.)" (p. 363). Between these alternatives Gray does not decide, yet an analysis of the manifestation of the people's feelings should shed some light on the question. But what is the danger, whether past or imminent, and what might be the "temporary alleviation"? On page 364 we appear to be informed: "The period to which we might most probably assign verses 1-5, 12-14 is that of Sennacherib; what is described is the revelry to which the city gave itself up when the Assyrian king in 701 B.C. raised the siege, or blockade, of Jerusalem." Here Gray appears to decide in favor of danger past and the joy of deliverance. But he does not tell us what he means by "a temporary alleviation." Does he hold to the historical character of Isa. 36-37, and put 22 1-14 in the midst of the campaign, as Robertson Smith does; or does he hold that the prophecy is to be placed after the final withdrawal of Sennacherib? In the latter case Isaiah must have expected some immediate disaster from another quarter. The reader is not informed on these points. On the next page (365) we read: (22 1-5) "A rhetorical question addressed by the prophet to the merry-making city which has swarmed up to the flat roofs to watch thence (Judg. 16 27) the spectacle of Sennacherib's retreat (cp. 37 22), or something similarly pleasing, such as the entrance into the city of the captive Assyrian vassal Padi, king of Ekron (Duhm)." Here again alternatives are presented and this time, since 37 22 (which must be the final retirement) is introduced into the argument, it would seem as if the choice lay between the final withdrawal of Sennacherib³⁶ and a date at the beginning of the campaign. This alternative is presented as if it made no difference which of the two possibilities is accepted. As a matter of fact, it makes the greatest difference. The significance of the prophecy for the eschatology of Isaiah is involved in this choice.

In the Introduction the author has something further to say on the questions raised by Isa. 22 1-14. At p. xciii we read: "So later,

³⁶ The allusion to 37 22 in this connection is unfortunate. The joy at Sennacherib's retreat is countenanced by Isaiah in chapter 37; in chapter 22 it is rebuked. The comparison suggests the great critical difficulties in which the prophecies supposed to be delivered in this period are involved.

while Isaiah insisted that no harm would befall the city from Sennacherib, he may have held, and apparently did hold (22 14), that harm would befall it from another quarter, unless they repented." Here Gray appears to have decided in favor of a date for 22 1-14 after the final withdrawal of Sennacherib. But in the comments on the passage itself this theory is presented as only one of several possibilities among which the reader is free to choose. Yet the view which Gray himself thus tentatively accepts in the Introduction is a very important element in his theory of the eschatology of Isaiah.

If we turn, finally, from the historical criticism of Isa. 22 1-14 to the literary criticism, the same vagueness and irresoluteness is observable. For example on pp. 363 ff. the question of the unity of the passage is raised. About the difficult verses 6-7 Gray says: "If vv. 6 f. are a real sequence, v. 6 describes some of the elements (Kir and Elam) in the army which on the day of Yahweh will attack Jerusalem" (p. 364). A little further down on the page he says: "It is doubtful whether v. 6 fits into the political situation"; and in fine print mentions the views of some of his predecessors about verse 6, among which Winckler's is pronounced "most improbable." The reasons for the views are not given. These remarks are made in the general introduction to the chapter. When we come to the exegesis of verses 6 and 7 we read: "On the question whether these verses form part of the vision of vv. 2b, 3, 5, see above pp. 363 ff." We are thus referred back to the Introduction, in which the question is raised, but not discussed exegetically. Neither is it discussed exegetically in what follows (pp. 367 ff.). That is, the relation of the verbs and suffixes in verses 6 and 7 to the preceding context, or of the subject (a siege) to the following context, is not commented upon, though these exegetical questions properly belong to the criticism of the verses. But on page 368 we finally discover something for which we have been looking, namely, a discussion of the question whether there can have been an Elamite contingent in the Assyrian army in 701. A good résumé of the historical facts bearing on the question is given, and then the conclusion: "In the light of these facts other alternatives are: (1) to understand Elam as equivalent to such few Elamite mercenaries as might serve in an Assyrian army though

Assyria and Elam were opposed to one another, or soldiers from those small portions of Elam which Sargon had temporarily annexed in 711; (2) to see in the verses the work of a later writer (cp. 11 11; 21 2); (3) with Winckler to treat the poem as a celebration of an Elamite attack, directed against the interests of Assyria, on a Babylonian town (Sippar)." With this the matter is dismissed. Gray thus concludes apparently with allowing the possibility of Winckler's view which he had just before pronounced "most improbable." No attempt is made to help the student to a decision between the various possibilities, and no explanation of the verses is given if the decision is in favor of their being late.

The examination we have made of Isa. 22 1-14 illustrates another of the defects of this commentary. Not only does the author frequently leave us in doubt about his own conception of a problem or his judgment on disputed points, but the matter is at times so ill-arranged that the reader, even when he knows just what he is looking for, often has hard work to find it. This fault belongs in some measure to all the International Critical Commentaries, and is to be ascribed to the plan of the series. It is fair to say also that the character of the Book of Isaiah and the enormous volume of literature upon it makes the problem of ordering the material an unusually difficult one. But the fact remains that in the volume before us the matter is not arranged and presented with that clearness which is one of the chief excellences of a commentary.

After so much in the way of criticism, let it be said in conclusion that Professor Gray's work has very great merits. Scholars will find in it the history of criticism and interpretation concisely but comprehensively presented, even down to last year's crop of articles and dissertations. It is solidly learned, too, and the student of the Hebrew text will find in the exegetical notes a very useful apparatus. The author is eminently fair-minded in his statement and estimate of other men's opinions. The indecisiveness which has been spoken of before is a result of the same temper; he does not want to make up his mind on insufficient evidence. It may be that judiciousness is sometimes in excess, but it is the defect of a good quality, even though on occasions an exasperating one.